

REMARKS

1. Present Status of Patent Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed July 18, 2008. Claims 1, 5, 8-14, and 17-18, 20, and 21 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to incorporate the features of former claims 7 and 16 (and any intervening claims), and claims 2-4, 7, 15, 16, and 19 have been canceled without prejudice, waiver or disclaimer. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

2. Examiner Interview

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy extended by the Examiner in an interview with Applicants' representative on September 19, 2008. During that interview, the Examiner confirmed that claims 20 and 21 are allowable and that claims 7 and 16 would be allowable if amended to include all the features of the independent claims and any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter and have amended the claims as appropriate so that the independent claims include the features of claims 7 and 16 and any intervening claims.

3. Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6, 8-15, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,958,013 to King et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,276. to Brawn. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 2-4, 7, 15, 16, and 19 and by the amendment of independent claims 1 and 10 to include the features of claims 7 and 16 and any intervening claims.

In particular, claim 1, as amended, recites: a method of managing a host session on a remote computer in a computer system, the method comprising:

sending a request to establish the host session from a client computer, the request including a presentation space, wherein the client computer has access to a plurality of properties files defining a plurality of screens for the host session, wherein the plurality of properties files

include at least one screen properties file for defining the screen data for the host session, the at least one screen properties file comprises a responses section, and the responses section comprises a response type for the response and identifying text for the response;

receiving in the presentation space a response to the request from the remote computer, the response including host screen data;

identifying the response by comparing the host screen data in the presentation space to screen data defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session, wherein the screen data defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session comprises a plurality of field definitions for data appearing on a host session screen, the definitions including at least one of a field name and a flag indicating whether a field is read only or read/write and wherein identifying the response by comparing the host screen data in the presentation space to screen data defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session comprises determining the response type for the response by comparing the host screen data to the identifying text defined for the response in the responses section of the at least one screen properties file; and

performing an action based on the identified response, wherein performing an action based on the identified response comprises:

If the response types is success, then processing the response; and

If the response type is reject, then printing the presentation space to an errors file. (Emphasis added)

The Office Action, at page 15, indicates that the prior art does not disclose the features now recited in claim 1, namely, “if the response is reject, then printing the presentation space to an errors file.” Accordingly, claim 1 is considered allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 10, as amended recites similar features as claim 1. Claims 20 and 21 also recite similar features as claim 1. Accordingly, claims 10, 20, and 21 are considered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 5, 8-9 and claims 14 and 17-18 depend ultimately from claims 1 and 10, respectively, and are considered allowable for at least the same reasons.

4. Objection to claims

Claims 7 and 16 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. This objection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. In addition, Applicants reserve the right to address any comments made in the Office Action that were not specifically addressed herein. Thus, such comments should not be deemed admitted by the Applicants. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (404) 233-7000.

Applicants respectfully submit that this Amendment is being submitted in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.34 by a registered patent practitioner acting in a representative capacity for Applicants.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer Pearson Medlin/

Jennifer Pearson Medlin, Reg. No. 41,385

October 3, 2008

MORRIS, MANNING, & MARTIN, L.L.P.
1600 Atlanta Financial Center
3343 Peachtree Road, N.E., Suite 1600
Atlanta, Georgia 30326-1044
(404) 233-7000